

### REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested. An *Ex Parte Quayle* Office action mailed November 3, 2004 is pending in the application. Applicants have carefully considered the Office action. The Office action allowed each of claims 1-2, 4-13, 15-23 and 25-34, but objected to informalities of claims 6, 17 and 27, as well as to the drawings. This response to the Office action amends claims 1-2, 4-11, 17 and 27, as well as the drawings and the specification to correct the informalities and overcome all objections and therefore place the application in condition for allowance.

#### Examiner Interview

Applicants thank Examiner Cumming for the courtesy of a telephone interview on December 15, 2004 to discuss the Office action mailed November 3, 2004. Applicants were represented by Mr. Dodson. During the interview, proposed amendments to the specification were discussed. The amendments presented herein do not add new matter in that they merely map the original description to the proposed drawing Figures 6-7. In addition, Examiner Cumming objected to the use of the term 'medium' in claims that may require a plurality of hosts.

#### Objections to the Drawings

In the Office action, the drawings were objected to as failing to show particular features of the claims. The proposed new Figures 6-7 are flow diagrams illustrating steps described in the original text. The specification has been amended to reference the drawing Figures 6-7. In compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.121(f), these amendments add no new matter since they only illustrate steps described in the text of the originally filed application.

#### Claim Objections

In the Office action, claims 6, 17 and 27 were objected to as including an informality requiring correction, presumably, that the term OAKLEY was insufficiently defined. "OAKLEY" is not an acronym. OAKLEY is a name of a cryptographic key


exchange protocol defined by H. Orman, "The Oakley Key Determination Protocol," Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) Request for Comments (RFC) No. 2412. (Specification, page 17, lines 3-14). Each of claims 6, 17 and 27 is amended herein to more positively define and identify the term.

During the interview of December 15, Examiner Cumming objected to the use of term 'medium' in its singular form in the claims requiring steps occurring at a plurality of hosts. Although, in an embodiment of the invention, computer-executable instructions for performing each claimed step may, in fact, reside on a single computer-readable medium such as a CD ROM (possibly further including installation instructions), claims 1-2 and 4-11 have nevertheless been amended herein to prevent any confusion.

#### CONCLUSION

The application is considered in good and proper form for allowance, and the examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Richard P. Dodson, Reg. No. 52,824  
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.  
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900  
180 North Stetson  
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6780  
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)  
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: January 24, 2005

In re Application of BAHL et al.  
Application No. 09/973,341

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheets include new Figures 6-7. The sheets, which include Figures 6-7, are in addition to the original sheets that include Figures 1-5.